

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0180 (3278.Palm)

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 14, 18, and 26 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-29 are now pending in this application.

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,785) in view of Kung (U.S. Patent No. 6,567,101) and Mäkelä et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,196). The Examiner asserts that Kim teaches the portable display in an expanded and folded state. Further, the Examiner asserts that Kung discloses a variable display frame on a display that may be expanded using a touch sensor by the user.

The Examiner further has asserted that one would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Kung that the sensing plate 102 is functionally equivalent to the desired sensor. The Examiner also states that "The use of a sensing plate helps detect the expansion of the display screen as taught by Kung." Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion in Kung that the sensing plate 102 is functionally equivalent to the desired sensor. The sensor of claims 1 and 2 is for sensing the expandability of a display, and not that of a window or frame that is being displayed on a display screen. Applicants are describing and claiming the expandability of a physical object, (i.e., a physical display) not an electronic or virtual display screen. The expandability of the physical display as taught and explained by Applicants' application was conceived to overcome the inherent small size of display screens for portable

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0180 (3278.Palm)

electronic devices. Accordingly, it would not have provided any advantage for Applicants to be concerned with a variable display frame on a portable device display screen. Thus, the desirability for one of ordinary skill in the art would be to make the combination of Kung and Mäkelä does not exist.

Also, the sensor of Applicants' invention is used for sensing the size or configuration of the expandable display, that is whether it is in a first size or in a second size, for example, whether the display screen is in a folded state or in a unfolded state. The sensor is used to automatically provide that information to the computer without user intervention. In Kung, all that is taught is the use of a touch screen in which the user has to input the size of the display frame. The point of Applicants' invention is that the user does not have to tell the computer what size or configuration the display screen is in, that is the sensor automatically communicates that information to the computer. Accordingly, there is no suggestion in Kung that the sensing plate 102 is functionally equivalent to the desired sensor. If the Examiner can provide such suggestion in the Kung patent, Applicants ask that the Examiner point out such suggestion. Absent such suggestion or motivation, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 18 and their respective dependent claims are therefore allowable.

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner also points to claims 6 and 19 and states that Kim teaches the means for securely maintaining the extension portion 103 in a state of folded over the main body 101. Applicants respectfully submit however that what is not taught by Kim is an expandable display in which the display is viewable by a user in both the first size and the second size configurations. The foldable display of Kim only has one useable size which is the display in the unfolded state. When the display is folded, the intent of the display in Kim is that the display will no longer be used because any of the display surfaces are not viewable by a user. Thus, for all of the reasons given above, claims 6 and 19 are allowable.

In section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Kung, Mäkelä, and further in view of Macuka (U.S. Patent No. 4,171,585). Applicants have claimed a rollable display in claims 7-8

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0180 (3278.Palm)

and 20. Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of Kim, Kung, Mäkelä, and Macuka discloses, teaches, or suggests the use of a rollable display as part of a portable electronic device. Macuka teaches a device for displaying portions of a rolled up map, a blueprint or similar article, that is a support device for displaying paper goods. Macuka does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the display is an electronic display which is inherent in Applicants' claim as the expandable display recited is coupled to a display controller. The paper goods disclosed in Macuka would never be coupled to a display controller which is coupled to computing electronics. Accordingly, there is no connection or suggestion of providing an expandable display in the form of a rollable display as taught by Applicants in any of Kim, Kung, Mäkelä, and Macuka. The rollable display as taught by Applicants is clearly missing from any of the references. The rollable display device of Macuka is just simply not an equivalent to the rollable display conceived by Applicants nor does a paper roll teach or suggest an electronic rollable display. Accordingly, claims 7-8 and 20 are allowable for these reasons and the reasons provided above in connection with their respective independent claims.

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-5, 14-17, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Kung, Mäkelä, and Kung et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,583). Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments with respect to independent claim 1 are applicable to claims 2-5 and independent claims 14 and 26. Independent claim 14, as amended, recites "physically resizing the display to a second size configuration." Similarly, claim 26 recites "a means for physically resizing the display to a second size configuration." Applicants respectfully submit that none of Kim, Kung, Mäkelä, and Kung et al. disclose, teach, or suggest both "physically resizing the display" and sensing automatically the second size configuration of the display. Applicants respectfully submit that what is taught by Kung et al. is simply a resizing of a display frame on a display screen not a physical resizing of the display configuration. Further, there is no automatic sensing of the physical size of the display screen, there is only a virtual detection of the size of a display frame on a display screen. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching, disclosure, or suggestion in any of Kim, Kung, Mäkelä, and Kung et al., alone, or in any proper

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0180 (3278.Palm)

combination that provides all of the claim limitations of independent claims 14, and 26, as well as the limitations of claims 2-5 which depend from independent claim 1. Further, there is no motivation or desirability to combine all four of these references or any combination thereof to arrive at Applicants' combination of claims 2-5, 14-17, and 26-29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5, 14-17, and 26-29 are allowable.

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-13 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Kung, Mäkelä, and further in view of Petrich (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,379). Applicants respectfully submit that although Petrich may teach a use of a variety of sensors, a variety of sensors are well known. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Petrich which would suggest the use of or the benefit of using a variety of sensors in Applicants' expandable display device. Petrich simply uses a variety of sensors for a human to interact with the display. What is claimed by Applicants is that the display size is changing and that information is communicated to the computer. What is taught by Petrich is manipulation of objects being shown on a display screen by the use of sensing devices. Accordingly, there is no logical connection between Petrich et al. and Applicants' invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine Kim, Kung, Mäkelä, and Petrich to provide Applicants' claimed inventions of claims 9-13 and 21-25. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-13 and 21-25 are allowable.

* * * * *

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0180 (3278.Palm)

being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 21, 2004By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,603